

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawing includes changes to Fig. 1 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

In Figure 1, a box labeled "Fabric 13c" was added.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 pages)
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s) (1 pages)

REMARKS

The drawings were objected to. Applicant has provided a proposed drawing change that shows the "switch fabric." This feature is supported in the paragraph starting on page 3, line 23. Applicant has also amended the specification to call for "switching fabric" as "switching fabric 13c." No new matter has been added.

The examiner excerpted from the MPEP but did not provide any objection or reasons therefore. Applicant requests clarification.

The examiner noted informalities in claim objections. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the objections.

The examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended the claims to correct antecedent basis and other minor errors.

The examiner rejected Claims 1-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robins et al. (hereinafter Robins) U.S. Patent 6,430,184 in view of Twomey U.S. Publication 2003/0131228.

Claim 1

Claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of Robins with Twomey, since no combination of the references describes or suggests, a security policy database cache including at least one primary table including signature values that indicate that a IPSec packet's security policy database (SPD) information may be in the cache and at least one secondary table including cache entries having a selector, flags, security association (SA) information and an operation to perform on the corresponding packet for which a cache lookup was made.

The examiner contends that:

As per claims 1, 17 and 27:

Robins teaches a method comprises: "producing a signature of a packet and at least first and second indexes into corresponding first and second primary table; (col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 8-38; col. 19, line 29-col. 20, line 66; col. 21, lines 20-61)."

reading contents of a bucket from a first one of the primary tables and a bucket from a second one of the primary tables to determine whether either of the

buckets have contents that match to the produced signature; (col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 8-38; col. 19, line 29-col. 20, line 66; col. 21, lines 20-61) and for a match, determining if a selector in an entry in a secondary table matches a selector of the packet; and if a match processing according to an operation indicated by the entry, (col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 8-38; col. 19, line 29-col. 66, line 18; col. 21, lines 20-61)

Robins does not explicitly disclose a security policy database cache. Twomey in analogous art, however, discloses a security policy database cache, (page 3, paragraphs 33-34; page 4, paragraphs 41-44 ; page 5, paragraph 52; page 7, paragraphs 73-76). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Robins with Twomey in order to store various security association parameters for use in processing packets. (page 3, paragraph 33)

The examiner uses Robins to teaches ... "producing a signature of a packet and at least first and second indexes into corresponding first and second primary table. Robbins whether at (col. 2, line 57-col. 3, line 15; col. 7, lines 8-38; col. 19, line 29-col. 20, line 66; col. 21, lines 20-61) or elsewhere fails to describe or suggest "a security policy database cache including at least one primary table including signature values that indicate that a IPSec packet's security policy database (SPD) information may be in the cache and at least one secondary table including cache entries having a selector, flags, security association (SA) information."

The examiner acknowledges that Robins does not explicitly disclose a security policy database cache and relies on Twomey ... (page 3, paragraphs 33-34; page 4, paragraphs 41-44 ; page 5, paragraph 52; page 7, paragraphs 73-76). However, Twomey taken in any combination with Robbins fails to disclose ", a security policy database cache including at least one primary table including signature values that indicate that a IPSec packet's security policy database (SPD) information may be in the cache and at least one secondary table including cache entries having a selector, flags, security association (SA) information and an operation to perform on the corresponding packet for which a cache lookup was made."

The examiner also argues that: "It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Robins with Twomey in order to store various security association parameters for use in processing packets. (page 3, paragraph 33)." However Applicant contends that this motivation is insufficient, since it merely motivates the combination to do what is already disclosed by the combination of references without addressing the features of the claims.

21583917.doc